



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/684,348

10/10/2003

Kevin D. Kissell

1778.3310000 (0189.00US)

4702

56074

7590

10/16/2008

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

ZHE, MENG YAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2195

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/684,348	Applicant(s) KISSELL, KEVIN D.	
	Examiner MENG YAO ZHE	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) ☐ Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-87 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The following claim languages are unclear and indefinite:

- i) Claim 1, lines 6-7, it is uncertain how the "instruction reschedules the program thread" <i.e. if the instruction is within the program thread, when the instruction is run to reschedule the thread it belongs to, essentially that thread would already have been executing, since the instruction that reschedules has to be running in order to schedule itself. This is contradictory and confusing.>

Claims 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, 86 have the same deficiencies as claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mobini, Patent No. 6,738,796 (hereafter Mobini).

6. As per claims 1, 15, 29, 42, 56, 75, 76, 86, Mobini teaches a method for rescheduling execution or deallocating execution by a processor of one of a plurality of threads, the method comprising:

issuing an instruction that accesses, from a data storage device, a portion of a record that encodes one or more parameters associated with one or more conditions under which one of the plurality of threads thread is or is not to be rescheduled to resume execution, wherein the one or more conditions are other

Art Unit: 2195

than a time limit for processing the one of the plurality of threads and processing the one of the plurality of threads according to the one or more conditions;

(Column 4, lines 30-35, lines 45-60; Column 7, lines 27-50)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-41, 43-55, 57-64, 65-74, 77-85, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mobini, Patent No. 6,738,796 (hereafter Mobini) in view of Dupree et al (Dupree), Patent No. 5,949,994.

9. Dupree was cited in the previous office action.

10. As per claims 16, 2, 30, 43, 57, Mobini does not specifically teach wherein the record is in a general purpose register (GPR).

Art Unit: 2195

However, Dupree teaches wherein the record is in a general purpose register (GPR) for the purpose of storing the status message. *(Column 30, lines 60- Column 31 lines 60; Moreover a GPR is a data storage)*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mobini with the specifics of wherein the record is in a general purpose register (GPR), as taught by Dupree, because it allows for the storage of status messages.

11. As per claims 17, 3, 31, 44, 58, 87, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread being deallocated rather than rescheduled. *(Column 27, lines 45-52)*

12. As per claims 18, 4, 32, 45, 59, 77, Dupree teaches the method of claim 17 wherein the parameter associated with the thread being deallocated is a value of zero. *(Fig 4B: no NAND gates. Column 25, lines 10-16: setting a bit and the fact that there is no NAND gate in the circuit means asserted high for scheduling. Therefore, zero for deallocation.)*

Art Unit: 2195

13. As per claims 19, 5, 33, 46, 60, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread being requeued for scheduling.

(Column 32, lines 40-61; Column 25, lines 10-16)

14. As per claims 20, 6, 34, 47, 61, Dupree teaches the method of claim 19 wherein the parameter is any-odd-value. *(Column 25, lines 10-16: the thread to be scheduled must have its scheduling bit set to 1, which is an odd value.)*

15. As per claims 22, 49, 63, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread relinquishing execution to another thread until a specific condition is met *(Column 26, lines 15-30)*

16. As per claims 23, 9, 50, 64, Dupree teaches the method of claim 22 wherein the parameter is encoded in one of a bit vector or one or more value fields in the record. *(Column 25, lines 10-16, Column 31, lines 5-60)*

17. As per claims 24, 10, 51, Dupree teaches wherein the processing further comprises resuming execution of the one of the plurality threads. *(Column 27, lines 45-67, Column 32, lines 20-60)*

18. As per claim 25, 38, 52, 65, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one or more of the parameters is associated with one of the plurality of threads being deallocated rather than rescheduled, and another of the parameters is associated with the thread being requeued for scheduling. *(Column 27, lines 45- 67: the PC is set for interrupt if to be rescheduled, which corresponds to another parameter. The a bit for the thread in the scheduler latch would be unset if the thread is to be deallocated.)*

19. As per claim 26, 8, 39, 53, 66, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one or more the parameters is associated with one of the plurality of threads being deallocated rather than rescheduled, and another of the parameters is associated with relinquishing execution to another thread until a specific condition is met. *(Column 27, lines 45- 67: relinquish until condition is met corresponds to rescheduling.)*

20. As per claim 27, 40, 54, 67, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread being requeued for rescheduling, and another of the parameters is associated with relinquishing execution to another thread until a specific condition is met. *(Column 27, lines 45- 67: The two scenarios are equivalent since after the condition is met, the thread must be rescheduled.)*

Art Unit: 2195

21. As per claim 28, 41, 55, 68, Dupree teaches the method of claim 15 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread being deallocated rather than rescheduled, another of the parameters is associated with the thread being requeued for scheduling, and another of the parameters is associated with relinquishing execution to another thread until a specific condition is met. *(Column 27, lines 45- 67: The two scenarios are equivalent since after the condition is met, the thread must be rescheduled.)*

22. As per claim 11, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 3 wherein, when the parameter equals a third value, the third value being different from the first and second values, the instruction unconditionally reschedules the program thread. *(Column 23, lines 1- 5, Column 25, lines 50- 67, Column 26, lines 15-30: there are different states for a context. When it is in the bidding state, the context has been scheduled unconditionally, and has an interrupt pending. Each state is represented by different values.)*

23. As per claim 12, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein one of the one or more conditions is a hardware interrupt. *(Column 25, lines 9-30)*

Art Unit: 2195

24. As per claim 13, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein one of the one or more conditions is a software interrupt. (*Column 25, lines 50-57*)

25. As per claim 14, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein, in the circumstance of the program thread being rescheduled, execution of the program thread resumes at a place in the thread following the instruction. (*Column 27, lines 45-67, Column 32, lines 20-60*)

26. As per claim 36, Dupree teaches the digital processor of claim 29 wherein one of the parameters is associated with the thread relinquishing execution to another thread until a specific condition is met. (*Column 25, lines 10-17, lines 50- 67; Column 26, lines 3- 15; Column 27, lines 45-67: relinquishing until a condition is met corresponds to interrupt and its service routines followed by rescheduling.*)

27. As per claim 37, Dupree teaches the digital processor of claim 36 wherein the parameter is encoded in one of a bit vector or one or more value fields in the record. (*Column 25, lines 10-20, Column 27, lines 45-67: latch and registers all corresponds to bit vector.*)

Art Unit: 2195

28. As per claim 69, 72, 73, 74, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein the instruction is a YIELD instruction. *(Column 27, lines 55-65: The inherent instruction issued to access the status of scheduler latch corresponds to the YIELD instruction.)*

29. As per claim 70, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein the portion of the record comprises a bit vector. *(Column 25, lines 10-20, Column 27, lines 45-67: latch and registers all corresponds to bit vector.)*

30. As per claim 71, Dupree teaches the mechanism of claim 1 wherein the portion of the record comprises one or more multi-bit fields. *(Column 25, lines 10-20, Column 27, lines 45-67)*

31. As per claim 78, Dupree teaches the method of claim 76 further comprising suspending the program thread from execution in response to the instruction when the parameter equals a second value, wherein the second value is different from the first value. *(Column 23, lines 1-5, Column 25, lines 50- 67, Column 26, lines 15- 30: there are different states for a context. The bidding state corresponds to thread suspension. When it is in the bidding state, the context has been scheduled unconditionally, and has an interrupt pending. Each state is represented by different values.)*

32. As per claim 79, Dupree teaches the method of claim 78 wherein the second value indicates that a condition required for execution of the program thread is

Art Unit: 2195

unsatisfied. *(Column 23, lines 1-5, Column 25, lines 50- 67, Column 26, lines 15-30: So long as an interrupt is pending, it is an indication that requirements for execution is unsatisfied.)*

33. As per claim 80, Dupree teaches the method of claim 79 wherein the condition is encoded within the parameter as a bit vector or value field. *(Column 25, lines 10-20, Column 27, lines 45-67: latch and registers all corresponds to bit vector.)*

34. As per claim 81, Dupree teaches the method of claim 78 further comprising rescheduling the program thread in response to the instruction when the parameter equals a third value, wherein the third value is different from the first and second values. *(Column 23, lines 1- 5, Column 25, lines 50-67, Column 26, lines 15-30: The idle state and its information corresponds to the third value.)*

35. As per claim 83, Dupree teaches the method of claim 81 wherein the third value is an odd value. *(Column 25, lines 10-16: the thread to be scheduled must have its scheduling bit set to 1, which is an odd value.)*

36. As per claim 84, Dupree teaches in a processor enabled to support multiple program threads, a method comprising:

executing an instruction that accesses a parameter related to thread scheduling, wherein the instruction is included in a program thread; *(See claim 15 rejection)*

Art Unit: 2195

suspending the program thread from execution in response to the instruction when the parameter equals a first value. (*Column 25, lines 10- 20, Column 26, lines 15-30, Column 27, lines 45-67: Descheduling temporarily only to be rescheduled later corresponds to suspending thread. Moreover, zero in the scheduling latch for descheduling corresponds to first value.*)

37. As per claim 85, Dupree teaches the method of claim 84 further comprising rescheduling the program thread in response to the instruction when the parameter equals a second value, wherein the second value is different from the first value. (*Column 25, lines 10- 20: bit is set to one for rescheduling.*)

38. As per claim 21, 7, 35, 48, 62, 82, Dupree teaches all of claim 19. Moreover, he teaches using two different numbers, 1 and 0, to represent the presence of a scheduled event and no event is being scheduled, respectively (*Column 25, lines 10- 15; Column 27, lines 45-67*). However, he does not specifically state that wherein the parameter is a two's compliment value of negative 1. It is well known that using two's compliment is a mere way of representing a number. Furthermore, any number can be used in a register to indicate an event. It does not matter if it is negative 1 or 1, as long as it is different from another number used to indicate a different type of event. The applicant fails to demonstrate any unexpected results from the use of negative one that cannot also be achieved with the differing values taught by Dupree.

Response to Arguments

39. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-87 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MENGYAO ZHE whose telephone number is (571)272-6946. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday, 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Li B. Zhen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194